

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are requested to be cancelled, amended, or added.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

In the Office Action, claims 1-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Burge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,638). Claim 1 recites that a method for executing an application in a computer system comprises receiving an identification of a first customer, identifying one or more applications stored in the computer system accessible to the first customer based on the identification, receiving a selection of a first application from the one or more applications to execute, and identifying one or more rules stored in the computer system applicable to the first application.

The method of claim 1 further comprises executing in the computer system one or more generic tasks stored in a first area accessible to all customers according to the identified one or more rules, and executing in the computer system at least one customized task according to the identified one or more rules, the at least one customized task being stored in a second area accessible only to the first customer, wherein the at least one customized task is different from any generic task and generated according to information provided by the first customer.

Burge relates to a computer system for customizing computer displays based on a user's past navigation history, needs, and preferences (col. 3, lines 45-56). More specifically, Burge discloses creating a profile for a user based on a user's navigation history and including personal data or characteristics, as well as display preferences (col. 6, line 50 – col. 7, line 37). This profile data 36 is analyzed by a determine display characteristics process 30, in conjunction with model parameters 38 (indicating certain user preferences) and general display variables 42 (indicating which display characteristics may be varied), to choose actual display characteristics 46 (col. 7, line 38 – col. 9, line 25). Burge further discloses that the selection of actual display characteristics 46 is based on a predictive model, which determines

the content and presentation of the content for a user (col. 9, lines 26-53). Based on the selection of actual display characteristics 46, the process 30 creates a customized display 48 (col. 9, lines 54-60).

In the rejection, it is asserted that the user profile data (including a user ID and password for using the service) corresponds to the rules, the display of general topics and categories to shoppers corresponds to the generic tasks, and the customized display corresponds to the customized tasks. First of all, Applicants respectfully disagree with these asserted correspondences. For example, rules identify which tasks to perform in an application and in what order. Although the user profile data is analyzed by the process 30 to generate customized displays 48, the user profile data does not determine which tasks to perform nor the order in which they are performed. Rather, it is the process 30 and its predictive model that dictate how displays are generated.

Similarly, the displays presented to the shoppers are not tasks. Rather, they are merely the result of the processing done by the process 30. In other words, the displays are not tasks executed by the application, but the result of the execution of tasks performed by the process 30. Indeed, since the process 30 is specifically configured to generate customized displays, not “general topics and categories,” the applications performed in Burge are either formed exclusively by generic tasks (for displaying general topics and categories) or exclusively customized tasks (for displaying customized displays) in contrast to claim 1, which requires the execution of both generic and customized tasks for the selected application.

Furthermore, Burge fails to disclose or suggest the at least one customized task being stored in a second area accessible only to the first customer. First, although Burge discloses that a user may be required to enter a user ID and password to access the service, Burge does not disclose or suggest that any information is stored in an area only accessible to that user. Second, to the extent the user profile data in Burge may be accessible only to that user, the user profile data is not a customized task. As asserted in the rejection, it at best corresponds to the recited rules.

Third, although the customized display (e.g., display 48) is generated in accordance with the user profile data, the customized display is not stored in an area accessible only to the first customer. Rather, a process 30, which is accessible to all users, analyzes the user profile data and generates the customized display 48 based on a predictive model that selects

actual display characteristics 46. The fact that the process 30 generates the customized display 48 during processing further confirms that the display 48 is not a task executed by the process 30 and is thus not stored in an area accessible only to the first customer. In other words, since the display 48 is only generated after the process 40 is executing, the display 48 is evidently not stored in an area accessible only to the first customer.

Accordingly, for all of these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Burge. Claims 2-4 are patentably distinguishable from Burge by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. Claims 5-45 are patentably distinguishable from Burge for reasons analogous to claim 1.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 7/4/06

By Man West Reg. No. 43250

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 26,874